THE INTERRELATIONSHIP OF MODERN, PRIMITIVE AND CHILDREN'S ART

A Thesis

Presented to

The School of Graduate Studies

Drake University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Fine Arts

by

Geri Halma

May 1972

THE INTERRELATIONSHIP OF MODERN, PRIMITIVE, AND CHILDREN'S ART

by

Geri Halma

Approved by Committee:

Chairman

Dean of the School of Graduate Studies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In 1876 the first American national art exhibition, the Centennial, was held at Philadelphia. Each artist painted according to his own style and ideas, producing no unified cultural expression.

> The exhibition was more or less of a hodgepodge. As a result both painter and public went away in a somewhat bemuddled condition. Perhaps the only thing about the exhibition that impressed one strongly was the general incompetence and inconsequence of it.[1]

Realizing a void in American art training, the younger artists, including Chase, Duveneck, and Eaton, made their way to Europe. Having studied in the ateliers[2] of Europe, the young artists attempted to enter their paintings upon their return to America in the exhibition of the Academy of Design. When the Academy refused, a new group was formed: The Society of American Artists. Within ten years the Society had increased its membership numbers to over one hundred artists. Its emphasis was on good workmanship and technique, two aspects they had transplanted from the European ateliers. Chase summarized his ideas:

> To my mind one of the simplest explanations of this matter of technique is to say that it is the eloquence of art. When a speaker has the gift of fine oratory we hang upon

---

[1] John C. Van Dyke, American Painting and Its Tradition (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1919), p. 7.

[2] European studios for art study.

> his words and gestures; we are spellbound by his intensity and his style, no matter on what subject he chooses to address us.[1]

The Society created an artistic atmosphere that demanded good workmanship and technique above any other consideration. This emphasis upon technique was enhanced in art education by the textile industry. In 1852 America imported $36,000,000 worth of textiles from Great Britain and $11,000,000 from France. The American businessman realized that if he were to compete in the textile market, he would need craftsmen and designers.[2] To fill this need, an Englishman, Walter Smith, was hired to serve as Director of Art for the State of Massachusetts, Supervisor of Art for Boston, and principal of the Normal School. Industrial drawing became an important vocational skill.

Another important art education segment was the "picture studies" course, taught because it adapted easily to the lecture-recitation method of study. Furthermore, to recognize masterpieces was a coveted accomplishment of "culture." The traditionally acceptable "old masters" were studied. The art of the past offered a spiritual release from the disorganization and problems of a society which was in the process of changing from an agricultural basis to a technical-industrial basis. In contrast the modernists insisted

---

[1] "Notes from Talks by William M. Chase," The American Magazine of Art, (September, 1917) cited by Van Dyke, p. 208.

[2] Eisner, Elliot W. "Some Historical Developments in Art Education," Concepts in Art Education. George Pappas, ed. (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1970), p. 13.

that art must express the current living conditions and work to improve life where it could. Art, as seen by the modernists, could contribute to a society only as it interpreted the society or as it shaped a new existence. But the reconciliation of the old to the new was not an easy transition.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

To develop art as a process of creativity and expression rather than as a technical skill or mirror-like representation was the awesome task of some artists, art educators, collectors, museum curators, press and others. The experimental work of Daumier, Courbet, Matisse, Picasso, Van Gogh, and other notable artists manifested new concepts in the use of materials, style of presentation, content, and the definition of art. These concepts were extentions of the art of previous cultures, but were also revolutionary and new. In one hundred years of experimentation, new philosophical thought was continuously challenging the preceding group. With these changing thoughts and this debating atmosphere, primitive art gained an appreciative audience in Western Europe which it had not previously had.

This appreciation was founded on the directness, simplicity, and strength of statement. A similar simple, direct statement was seen in children's art. Art education changed as artists and art educators saw beauty of expression in children's art rather than mere inability to meet adult standards. Art educators, such as Cizek, encouraged children to remain in this individual, unsophisticated state as long as possible.

Although all of this exciting change was occurring over an extensive period of time, American artists were studying in Europe, and communication through tourism and commerce between the continents was available, the American public remained virtually ignorant of this gigantic change. However, according to one historian, America left her adolescence and began to change at the turn of the century. Frederick Logan has stated that we made so many discoveries in these few years (1900-1914) that we are still assimilating the significances of artist groups exhibited in this brief span.[1]

The purpose of this study, therefore, will be to look at this significant, transitional period in the history of American art and art education from 1900-1930. What kinds of people were effective change agents? Which activities proved to be effective disseminators of new ideas? Who were the philosophical sources of inspiration? How were the basic attitudes toward art and art education related?

These new ideas led many educators into a new concept of education which emphasized the processes of thinking instead of factual studies. These concepts are currently undergoing further research and analysis.

> . . . it is obvious that art and literature and all forms of creative thought have largely shaped that enveloping culture, that stream of thought which is civilization. . . . Considering man's hostility to change and innovation, . . . it is astonishing that so much of creative and imaginative genius has contrived to leave its impress on the human race. Yet who can doubt that more, habited in weak bodies, blasted early by ignorance and cruelty and superstition, has perished with no record? In our

---

[1]Frederick M. Logan, Growth of Art in American Schools (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955).

> comparatively low civilization a little is done under favorable circumstances to salvage great talent, to give it opportunity to grow and express itself. Yet how pitifully meager is our salvage and how great the waste! We know that this is so. A more civilized time than ours will strive to develop this, the greatest of all natural resources.[1]

PROCEDURE AND LIMITATIONS

Various book sources, essays, periodicals and unpublished works will be used to interrelate information about the modernist art movement, primitive art interests, and concurrent art education directions.

This research is to take the form of an overview looking at the changes that took place in the attitudes toward accepting modern art and children's art at the beginning of the twentieth century in relation to art education. Its purpose is not to study all the aspects of the Armory Show, or everything about Stieglitz, or the Eight (Robert Henri, George Luks, John Sloan, William Glackens, Everett Shinn, Maurice Prendergast, Arthur B. Davies, and Ernest Lawson), but more specifically to provide an overview to what happened and how it produced innovations in the field of art education.

---

[1] Carl H. Garbo, The Creative Critic (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), cited by Sidney J. Parnes, "Can Creativity Be Increased?" Creativity and Art Education, ed. W. Lambert Brittain (Washington: National Art Education Association, n. d.), p. 44.

CHAPTER 2

THE ATTACK ON ACADEMIC ART

> To have art in America will not be to sit like a packrat on a pile of collected art of the past.[1]

The scathing comment, above, was directed against the popularized concepts of art which flourished in the United States from the Civil War until World War I. Academic art, contrary to many reports, was not exemplified in one particular style but rather followed acceptable styles of tradition, such as the classical tradition of Ingres and adaptations of Renaissance and Baroque artists.[2] Because of the emphasis on traditional styles, paintings and drawings were characterized by accuracy, perfect techniques, virtuoso brushwork, and subjects of a historical moral or a contemporary, edifying nature.[3]

These goals became further entrenched in the American art world because the Academy,[4] founded in New York in 1826, conducted an art school and presented the recognized annual exhibitions. The works to be exhibited were selected by a jury from the membership

---

[1] Robert Henri, The Art Spirit (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1939), p. 130.

[2] William Innes Homer, Robert Henri and His Circle (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969), p. 2.

[3] Homer, pp. 2-3.

[4] There were several academies in America at this time--in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Boston. For instance, the New York academy called itself the National Academy of Design. American academic art was comparable to European academic art.

of the Academy. As the Academy aged, the jurors who became set in their own ideas also became academicians, and therefore perpetuated their own kind of art, ignoring the creative ventures of new artists.[1]

> There were few free artistic forums where an unknown or unconventional artist might be heard. The major art markets or publicity channels for art were the academy exhibitions. . . . These exhibitions were ruled by the twin evils of the "jury" and the "white card." The academy jury by its very composition tended to accept only what would pass the muster of divergent opinion, so that, like a compromise candidate in politics, the least controversial rather than the best available material was chosen. Even the faintest departure from the norm was sure to find some opposition and, consequently, rejection. The white card on the other hand permitted the hanging unjudged of several hundred members' pictures. Because the space remaining was limited, usually less than a hundred pictures were picked by the jury from the hundreds submitted by competing artists throughout the country. The younger artists were consequently faced with fierce competition in which they could hope to prevail only through conformity with accepted standards.[2]

With this kind of academic control in 1909, Marinetti described the museums as "'graveyards of vain efforts . . . Mount Calvaries of crucified dreams.'"[3] These paintings then belonged to the historians, not the painters.

INFLUENCE OF HENRI AND THE SOCIAL REALISTS

These practices of the academies were challenged by Robert Henri. He believed that art and life were vitally related and

---

[1]Homer, pp. 3, 74.

[2]Milton W. Brown, American Painting (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), p. 4.

[3]Joshua Taylor, "The History of Art in Education," A Seminar in Art Education for Research and Curriculum Development (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 1966), p. 44.

that the artist who wished to express the sensations of one experience must feel an intense response to this experience. Such experiences produced the spirit of life. "The reason so many artists have lived to great age and have been so young at great age is that to such extent they have lived living, whereas most people live dying."[1] To paint and live intensely, Henri saw no similarity to the academician's goal to prettiness. To show dissatisfaction with the prettiness of art, he abandoned the academic finish and detail.[2] In abandoning detail and virtuoso brushwork, Henri attempted to represent the experience with an economy of means so that its intensity would be pure.

Hoping to aid his artist friends who were rejected by the Academy, Henri, deciding to cash in on his reputation,[3] accepted the invitation to join the Society of American Artists in 1904. In his diary he wrote, "Accepted with idea that I might get them to invite pictures by A. B. Davies who has not been sending to S.A.A. because of previous bad treatment.'"[4] Originally formed in rebellion

---

[1]Henri, p. 160. [2]Homer, p. 109.

[3]In 1899 four of his canvasses were selected unanimously to be hung in the Salon exhibition. Of these, the French government, purchased La Neige, paying tribute to Henri (a high honor for an American painter as less than ten other Americans had received this kind of honor.) As a leader of the liberal painters, he was invited to exhibit in the Allen Gallery in New York. The proprietor of the New York School of Art, Douglas John Connah, invited Henri to teach classes. Since this school was one of the city's leading art academies, this invitation was an honor. In 1903 he received several portrait commissions, was asked to serve on several juries at the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, and invited to be a member of the Society of American Artists.

[4]Henri diary, December 6, 1904, cited by Homer, p. 118.

against the Academy, the Society had also become conservative and academic over a period of twenty-seven years. Therefore, when Henri attempted to help the young progressive painters--Luks, Shinn, Sprinshorn, Kent, and Glackens--enter the exhibition, the paintings were rejected and two of his three paintings were rated No. 2 on the second judging. In addition, two paintings by Luks and Sprinshorn originally accepted were taken from the show with the excuse that there was not sufficient wall space. Henri promptly withdrew his two paintings, calling for free thinking and a belief in individual expression. A conflict between the progressives[1] and the conservatives arose immediately, stirring up a great deal of publicity. The publicity was favorable to Henri's position--since Henri met often with artists, poets, writers, and critics at Mouquin's and the Café Francis to discuss the purpose of art. Understanding these goals, art critics such as Charles Fitz Gerald and Byron Stephenson had previously defended Henri's work at the earlier Macbeth exhibition in New York.[2] The press, suggesting Henri's secession from the Society and the formation of a rival group, encouraged him to take a firm position with the Society. When he threatened withdrawal, the Society, making it impossible for him to stay, refused to elect to their membership more than three of the list of thirty-six

---

[1]The progressives, later called the "Eight," "Black Revolutionary Gang," or "Ash Can Painters, were a loosely organized group of artists who painted life as they saw and experienced it. They received the group names for their unappreciated paintings of the slums and similar subjects.

[2]Homer, pp. 108-9, 150.

qualified artists[1] and refused to reelect him to the jury for the next two exhibitions.[2] In April, 1907, Henri withdrew from the academic group and formed the group called "The Eight."[3]

The Eight intended to expand their numbers, to hold exhibitions in competition with the Academy, and to gain financial support via a large public audience.[4]

> In its fight against the academic style the Ash Can School[5] stood for "truth" as against "beauty," for "life" as against "art," for the "real" as against the "artificial." They accepted Henri's advice: "Be willing to paint a picture that does not look like a picture." The realists defended crudity and ugliness because such things were true. The gentility of the academicians was to them a sign of effeteness, nor was it expressive of the more vital aspects of American life. They saw lusty and vigorous activity around them, which with all its crudeness was still colorful and romantic and which the refined esthetic ideas of the academic painters were incapable of expressing. The realists loved life. Under Henri's guidance "life" became almost an obsession. They looked upon the tricks of art as lies which hid the truth. They became suspicious of that type of beauty which was the earmark of academic painting. The decorative picture, slick brushwork, academic formulas, foggy estheticism were all denials of what was real and earnest. They fought the isolation which was deeply rooted in American art. They refused to dodge the philistinism, the gaucheness of American life; on the contrary, they sought to live and picture that life in its common aspects. If you got life into your art, they thought, then beauty would take care of itself.[6]

---

[1] Including Arthur B. Davies, Ernest Lawson, and Jerome Myers. Letter of Henri, April 12, 1907, "most of whom were excellent artists--some the very best," cited by Homer, p. 128.

[2] Homer, pp. 115-128.

[3] Robert Henri, George Luks, John Sloan, William Glackens, Everett Shinn, Maurice Prendergast, Arthur B. Davies, Ernest Lawson.

[4] Homer, p. 131. [5] the Eight. [6] Brown, pp. 12-13.

In 1908 the group successfully exhibited at Macbeth Galleries in New York. In this exhibition were scenes from the crowded city of the New York immigrant slum population which the artists found exciting and colorful. To Henri the poor were "'my people . . . through whom dignity of life is manifest.'"[1] To Eugene Higgens, there was envy and unrest in the slums, but also poetry, caring, and sentiment. There were fights, horrible suffering, and despair in the living hell. To others, such as Jerome Myers, slums were a "'tapestry of romance' where 'reality faded in a vault of dreams.'"[2]

Of this show Henri reported to a friend: "The show at Macbeth's is creating a sensation." Over seven thousand attended the show and bought paintings values as high as four thousand dollars, making the show a financial success. Sloan was excited as he jotted in his diary: "We've made a success--Davies says an epoch . . . Macbeth is 'pleased as Punch.'"[3] Much of the show's success has been attributed to the publicity in the New York newspapers which was a result of Henri's constant contact with critics such as Fitz Gerald, Stephenson, Gregg, and Huneker.[4] Henri's students had unsuccessfully attempted similar shows, but this show at Macbeth Galleries was hailed as "the first well-organized, successful presentation of an important

---

[1]Robert Henri, "My People," Craftsman, XXVII (February, 1915), p. 459, cited by Brown, p. 13.

[2]Jerome Myers, Artist in Manhattan, p. 49, cited by Brown, pp. 11-12.

[3]Sloan Diary, February 17, 1908, cited by Homer, p. 138.

[4]Homer, p. 138.

new kind of American painting . . ."[1] The show was later exhibited in Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, Toledo, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Bridgeport, Connecticut, and Newark.[2]

On January 10, 1910, the Eight, regrouped with additional artists as Independent Artists, held a second exhibition entitled "The American Art Show."

> In the evening came a real triumph, the three large floors were crowded to suffocation, absolutely jammed at 9 o'clock. The crowd packed the sidewalk outside waiting to get in. A small squad of police came on the run. It was terrible but wonderful to think that an art show could be so jammed. A great success seems assured. . . . There were at least 2000 people on hand in the evening.[3]

Again much of the success of the show was attributed to Henri's influence with the press, for he explained the meaning and significance of the show in relationship to the development of American art. He pleaded with the public to accept "'those who are pushing forward, who need and deserve recognition, who must have encouragement, who should receive praise for every step of their advance.'"[4] This show was the culmination of Henri's efforts, for after this show, more progressive, younger artists supplanted his influence.[5] For instance, the Armory Show in 1913 was organized by Henri's group and other artists, who chose Arthur Davies as their leader, passing over Henri.

---

[1] Homer, p. 146. [2] Homer, p. 146.

[3] Sloan Diary, April 1, 1910 cited by Homer, 151-4.

[4] "The New York Exhibition of Independent Artists," Craftsman, XVIII (May, 1910), pp. 160-1, cited by Homer, p. 155.

[5] Homer, pp. 155-6.

THE MODERNISTS GET A HEARING AT STIEGLITZ' GALLERIES

Although the Eight were social realists, they prepared their public for the nonsocial tendencies of modernistic work shown in Alfred Stieglitz' galleries. Stieglitz exhibited the work of artists who insisted on experimentation, both in media and in the organization of subject matter, in contrast to the subject matter emphasis of the social realists. For instance, in paintings prior to Cézanne, external light caused the object's color changes to advance or to recede. Since the slightest change in light changed the balance of these colors, the balance was uncontrollable, altering the composition. To the trained eye, these slight variations caused the picture to appear "off." Cézanne discovered this basic but momenous principle. The application of this principle was Cézanne's most difficult problem.[1] Such artists changed the form of picture making, not just the content of the pictures. Furthermore, the visual aspect of the varied pictures shown in Stieglitz' galleries were distorted African sculpture decorations and motifs, symbolism and directness of children's art, and brilliant colors of the Persian ceramist.[2] Beginning in 1908 with a show of fifty-eight Rodin drawings, Stieglitz launched his campaign to exhibit the controversial and revolutionary aspects of modern art. These six hundred fifty exhibitions and Stieglitz' conversations helped keep many artists alive with financial and spiritual aid. Stieglitz created a number of centers where anyone

---

[1]Willard Huntington Wright, Modern Painting (New York: John Lane Company, 1915), pp. 140-51.

[2]Frederick M. Logan, Growth of Art in American Schools (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955), pp. 128-9.

could examine, question, and share his spirit. Some of these art centers were "291," where works of Cézanne, Picasso, Matisse, African carvers, children, and Georgia O'Keeffe were shown; Room 303, showing works of American artists--O'Keeffe, Marin, Dove, and others; and in An American Place.[1]

Furthermore, in his magazine, Camera Work, Stieglitz staunchly defended the new artistic trends. He considered creation as the sole justification of life, not just an expression of life as Henri believed. Creative expression was a mystic spiritual experience which separated the individual from a mechanized society.[2] He described his purpose and work as follows:

> What was wanted was not money, but that people should have some respect and a feeling for life; for it was out of life that these pictures had come. Everyone was being protected except the American artist. The rich people had gardeners to tend their apple trees.[3]

Stieglitz continued to be "gardener" for American and foreign artists as he "radiated a force unique in a critical phase of mankind's sojourn on earth, a force vital--though most of America ignored it or passed it by in silence. . . ."[4] He was unable to penetrate and explore his ideas with the American public, only with a more art-conscious group or certain individuals. Moreover, the development of the new art was exhibited only in segments, not as a totality. For these goals to materialize, it took the Armory Show of 1913.

---

[1]Herbert J. Seligmann, Alfred Stieglitz Talking, (New Haven: Yale University Library, 1966), pp. iii-iv.

[2]Brown, pp. 40-1. [3]Seligmann, p. 119. [4]Seligmann, p. iii.

CHAPTER 3

MODERN ART GAINS A FOOTHOLD IN EXHIBITIONS

> Since 1914 we have been busy assimilating the significance of art forms, contemporary, historical, and primitive, which were unknown or largely ignored before that time, and which certain artist groups succeeded in forcing upon the attention of this country.[1]

THE ARMORY SHOW

The contemporary, experimental European and American art was presented by the International Exhibition of Modern Art,[2] held in the Armory of the 69th regiment, from February 17 to March 15, 1913. This show was organized by the AAPS, American Association of Painters and Sculptors, comprised of the Eight and other artists. The Armory Show grew to significance as the single largest exhibition containing most of the newest, experimental work of European artists and the current work of American artists. Arthur B. Davies' extraordinary efforts in planning, organization, and European travels made the Armory Show a reality.

Although the American work outnumbered the European work, the European work stole the public's attention as a revelation of the new artistic ventures.[3] The paintings of Corot, Courbet, Delacroix, and Daumier finally penetrated the American scene after almost 100 years of obscurity.[4] Also included and equally unknown were the impressionists

---

[1] Frederick M. Logan, Growth of Art in American Schools (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955), p. 125.

[2] Selected art from the Armory Show also shown in Chicago and Boston.

[3] H. H. Arnason, History of Modern Art (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.), p. 410.

[4] Logan, p. 126.

from the 1860's, post impressionists from the 1880's, and the more contemporary Fauves and Cubists. Although some Americans had had the opportunity of viewing these paintings in smaller exhibitions at "291" and the Folsom Gallery,[1] the Armory Show provided the panorama of growth in a comprehensive survey and presented a coherent explanation of the development of modern art.[2]

One of Davies' purposes for promoting the Armory Show was to explain the philosophy of art. By its nature the avant-garde art is composed of

> speculative and original individuals who are ahead of their fellow artists or citizens, searching out new ideas and new forms, provoking novel responses, teasing out the incipient characteristics of a culture, deliberately discarding the accepted solutions and generally transforming in fresh symbolic ways the conditions of life.[3]

The paradox that revolutionary art became traditional art in time exemplified the essence of art. For instance, impressionists were presented as a revolutionary continuation of their tradition. In time their art was considered conservative as the newer, revolutionary art supplanted it as the avant-garde. In each instance the revolutionary art was at first rejected but later accepted. From this, the public might have concluded that this currently misunderstood art would be accepted one day. "The inevitable gap between the revolutionary creator and

---

[1]Milton W. Brown, American Painting (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), pp. 57-8.

[2]Milton W. Brown, The Story of the Armory Show (New York: The Joseph H. Hirshhorn Foundation, 1963), p. 90.

[3]Irving Kaufman, Art and Education in Contemporary Culture (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1966), p. 347.

the conservative spectator demanded on the part of the latter an effort at learning and a reservation of judgment."[1]

The New York Sun wrote of the show that the AAPS "'has wrought something very like a miracle,' the Show was 'sensational,' 'an event not on any account to be missed.'"[2] The press covered the show extensively: some critics praised it, others attacked it. For instance, Duchamp's Nude Descending the Staircase was labeled as "'an explosion in a shingle factory.'"[3] However, the idea was implanted that modern art had tapped life in its elemental form. Reports in the Toronto Globe and the New York Post Express stated that modern art had captured a youthful vitality in comparison to the academic paintings. As a result of this publicity, approximately 75,000 people attended the controversial show in New York. Jerome Myers recalled the crowds, jamming the streets with carriages and cars, waiting in lines to see the show, and in some cases being turned away. "'It was the wildest, maddest, most intensely excited crowd that ever broke decorum in any scene I have witnessed.'"[4] On March 15, the Globe summarized the effect on the American public.

> "A crowd has been made to come, not only once, but several times, laughing at first, perhaps, less protesting afterward, and finally profoundly interested. . . . It has made men stop and think, made the public wonder if, after all, there was not something really worth their while in this courageous departure from convention. They have set New York and its artists by the ears."[5]

---

[1] Brown, The Story of the Armory Show, p. 90.

[2] Brown, The Story of the Armory Show, p. 86. [3] Arnason, p. 414.

[4] Brown, The Story of the Armory Show, p. 161.

[5] Globe, March 15, cited by Brown, The Story of the Armory Show, p. 155.

Through such accounts, public opinion was affected. The public became aware of the creative work of the artists represented. "The effect of this publicity cannot be overestimated, for it was the opening wedge for all later exploitation of modern art."[1]

Although there were requests to exhibit the Armory Show in St. Louis, Milwaukee, Kansas City, Baltimore, Washington, and Toronto, the show was dismantled after touring New York, Chicago, and Boston due to the demands of European artists and salons to have their work returned as well as the waning interest displayed in Boston.

SUBSEQUENT ART EXHIBITIONS

With this spectacular introduction to modern art, the art market was profoundly altered, resulting in numerous modern collections. For instance, Lillie B. Bliss, with Davies' help, bought a Renoir, two Degas, two Redons, and a Cézanne landscape--a collection which eventually became the nucleus of the Museum of Modern Art.[2] Excited with the revolutionary art in the Armory Show, Jerome Eddy bought seventeen modern pictures. ". . . The major importance of the first American collectors of modern art . . . (was their role) . . . as instruments in the propaganda for modernism."[3] Many of the collectors wrote and lectured in defense of modern art as they attempted to educate the American public.

---

[1] Brown, American Painting, p. 58. [2] Brown, American Painting, p. 96.

[3] Brown, American Painting, p. 92.

Previous to the Armory Show, American collectors collected works of the past almost exclusively, because the accumulation of traditional art works was a "potential short cut to culture and tradition."[1] "There was a widespread desire to own objects of art imported from abroad, and the nouveax riches were adorning their homes with paintings by the European masters."[2] Not familiar with esthetic principles, the art collectors bought art that was acceptable to the critics. Since these critics supported academic art, the art collectors bought academic art. Although the collector did not dictate public taste or art styles, his financial expenditures influenced the artist who had to support himself.[3] Academic art had been a commercially successful commodity in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century America. As such, it made sense for academic artists, juries, and teachers to lend each other support. Financial advantage and public acclaim, though not of course the only considerations that motivated the academicians, were major forces underlying their efforts to maintain a position of power in the world of American art.[4]

When European and American academic art lost their American market, many artists changed their art. Those who felt the vitality of the new art plunged into new experimentation, and a few went individual

---

[1] Brown, American Painting, p. 92.

[2] Francis Bland Belshe, A History of Art Education in the Public Schools of the United States (unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, Yale University, 1946), p. 66.

[3] Brown, American Painting, p. 92.

[4] William Innes Homer, Robert Henri and His Circle (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969), p. 3.

ways; but the hardened academicians painted and exhibited as if nothing had happened.[1] Since the realists, Henri's students, believed that art was an expression of life and identified culturally with the people, they were unable to explore esthetic problems of the modernists without reference to social problems.[2] Because of their inability to adjust to the personal abstract problems of the modernist movement, the realist movement terminated quickly.

Another factor contributing to the acceptance of modern art was the growing number of exhibitions featuring modern artists. The Daniel Gallery, opening in December 1913, and the Carnegie Institute exhibited modern art. In 1914, the Taylor Galleries of Cleveland exhibited "Post-Impressionists," and the Bourgeois Galleries showed both "old and modern masters." Other galleries and art societies followed the trend, showing foreign and domestic modern art work. Small galleries, such as the Gamut Club, Liberal Club, Thumb Box Gallery, Cosmopolitan Club, Carroll Gallery, and Modern Gallery gave young artists the opportunity to exhibit.[3] One show at Montross of modern Americans, Prendergast, Kuhn, Schamberg, Sheeler, Stella, and others, was later exhibited around the country for several years.

On March 13 to 25, 1916, in the Anderson Galleries, Alfred Stieglitz, John Weichsel, W. H. Wright, W. H. de B. Nelson, Christian Brinton, and Robert Henri planned a second exhibition of American modern art which was to be more selective than the Armory Show. These men disliked the circus-like atmosphere of the big show and thought

---

[1]Brown, American Painting, p. 48-9. [2]Brown, American Painting, p. 60.

[3]Brown, American Painting, pp. 50-1.

too many works were added without sufficient discriminatory screening. This exhibition, entitled the Forum Exhibition, was planned on a smaller Scale to create a more congenial atmosphere between the work and the spectator and to eliminate some of the poorer art shown in the massive Armory Show. The sixteen participating artists wrote a brief statement of intention which was included in the catalogue.

Another show featured the liberal academic and the modern artists in the Independents Exhibition in 1917. Patterning themselves after the avant-garde galleries of Europe, such as the Salon des Indépendants, they decided to eliminate the jury and prizes. Through an open atmosphere of exhibiting they wanted to give the American artist sufficient freedom to arrive at individual, vital art. Exhibiting 2500 works by 1300 artists from thirty-eight states, they attempted to rival the Armory Show.[1] The show, however, created little excitement as it was eclipsed by America's entry into World War I.

Not only were galleries showing the new developments in European art but for the first time America was keeping pace with the current developments in Europe. "We were, then, again importing influences, but importing them while they were still alive, and that was in itself progress."[2]

---

[1] Brown, American Painting, pp. 65-71.

[2] Brown, American Painting, p. 57.

CHAPTER 4

A STRUGGLE FOR ARTISTIC MATURITY

> The struggle against complacency had been successful. The earlier provincial boastfulness had given place to an earnest groping for maturity.[1]

A MATURING OF AMERICAN ARTISTS

Although World War I created changed from the routine life, it didn't change the direction of modern art since the artists were involved in esthetic experimentation rather than expressing a social consciousness. Artists, such as Marcel Duchamp and Francis Picabia, fled to the United States, strengthening our ties with Europe, Through these ties American art became more international: a natural development following the precedence of the last decade. For instance, Duchamp, Man Ray, Picabia, and others formed the Dada group, similar to the European counterpart, which tried to shock the public rather than expose the philistine. "Modernism in America as well as abroad was an escape as well as a revolt--an escape from social problems and a revolt against established artistic forms. . . ."[2]

In addition to the exchange of ideas and experimentation, a native art was growing. For instance, the Precisionists[3] became identified as

---

[1]Milton W. Brown, American Painting from the Armory Show to the Depression (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), p. 81.

[2]Brown, American Painting, p. 81.

[3]Also called cubist-realists, cubo-realists, immaculates.

"the most significant manifestation of a new spirit in American art during the 1920's."[1]

This art was characterized by so much geometric simplification that the realistic base became abstract in its impact. This group included Georgia O'Keeffe, Charles Sheeler, Charles Demuth, and Niles Spencer. Other artists tried to reveal the meaning of the machine age in America by painting factories, warehouses, railroads and additional native scenes. For instance, Stuart Davis' collages of the 1920's "are explorations of the everyday scene. . ."[2] The primitives, John Kane, Emile Pierre Banchard, and Canadé were painting in obscurity. However, in the thirties primitive painting would become popular.[3]

PRIVATE ART COLLECTORS' ROLE IN ART DISSEMINATION

While artists were developing along modernist lines, private art collectors, rather than museum curators, played a decisive role in the dissemination and collection of modern art. Although museums aided the cause of modernism through exhibitions, they were unable to cut through the red tape of the checks and counterchecks of their purchasing policies.[4]

One of these private collectors, a lawyer John Quinn, knew little about art, but nevertheless collected modern art. He bought art to support artists almost as a collector of personalities rather than art objects. In his collection were works by Marin, Weber, Cézanne, Sheeler,

---

[1]H. H. Arnason, History of Modern Art (Englewood Cliffs: N. J. Prentice-Hall, Inc.), p. 415.

[2]Arnason, p. 425. [3]Brown, American Painting, p. 81.

[4]Brown, American Painting, p. 94.

Hartley, works of most of the "Eight," and others. In 1926 and 1927 his collection stirred the public, as the sales of John Quinn's collection totalled $700,000. Whether one agreed with modernism or not, the monetary value of these paintings had increased at an incredible rate. The public and some of the press who scoffed at the eccentric collecting of modern art did a double take. They quickly accused the museums for not having the foresight to collect while the paintings were cheap. "Whereas previously modernists had been dubbed crackbrained revolutionaries, now museum directors were denounced as blind old fogies."[1]

This group of private collectors banded together in a way unique to American collecting. They wished to educate the public. Moreover they did not buy art works as symbols of financial and cultural achievement because they admired the new art and were patrons of the modern artists. To rally support for their collections, they saw the need to proselytize, so they wrote and established educational institutions. Of the new collectors, Albert C. Barnes, Arthur Jerome Eddy, Katherine Dreier, Duncan Phillips, and A. E. Gallatin lectured and wrote books and articles; and Barnes, Dreier, Phillips, Gallatin, and Lillie P. Bliss used their collections for educational purposes. The writing and educational institutions surrounding such collections were exemplified in the following writing:

---

1 Brown, American Painting, p. 95.

> Art--"a fragment of life presented to us enriched in feelings by means of the creative spirit of the artist"[1]--enters into such close union with life, is so much a part of it, that an understanding of a genuine evolution of painting can be based only upon the very principle that governs life itself: today has its roots in yesterday. Translated into art-terms and applied particularly to painting, it expresses the idea that modern or contemporary art represents a logical dénouement from the interplay of preceding traditional forms. . . . This conception is the keystone that firmly supports the educational program of the Barnes Foundation[2] and around which are gathered its collections of old and modern pictures, its French and Persian miniatures and its pieces of Egyptian, Chinese, Hindu, Greek, Negro and contemporary sculpture. The Foundation's courses in art appreciation center upon a tracing of the essential continuity of art traditions. Its program is objectively carried out by demonstrations in front of the particular works of art under discussion; it is organized into a practical application of the psychological and scientific principles represented by the most modern methods of education.[3]

Similar art collections--Phillips Memorial Gallery, the Gallery of the Living Art, the Museum of Modern Art--were institutionalized for educational purposes in an attempt to support and to create a favorable atmosphere for modern art.

The prosperity of the twenties produced another group of collectors--Adolph and Samuel Lewisohn, Chester Dale, Stephen C. Clark, John T. Spaulding, Helen Birch Bartlett, Lewis Larned Coburn, A. Conger Goodyear, Mrs. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Carroll Tyson, and Henry P. McIlhenny--who collected modern art as objects essentially the

---

[1]Mary Mullen, An Approach to Art (Barnes Foundation Press).

[2]The Barnes Foundation was established in Merion, Pennsylvania, in 1925 to educate its students and to publish the Journal. The school was open for visitors, including students from other schools, if they made prior reservations so as not to conflict with the classes in session.

[3]Violette De Mazia "Continuity of Traditions in Painting" Translated and adapted from L' Art Ancien a la Fondation Barnes, by Violette de Mazia, Leo Arts a Paris, October, 1927. Thomas Munro, ed. Art Education (New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1956), pp. 103-4.

same way as the earlier collectors collected academic art.[1] Their collecting resulted in the following prices in 1922--$40,000 for an Abbott Thayer figure-piece, $50,000 for Winslow Homer's Eight Bells, $60,000 for George Innes' Spirit of Autumn, and approximately $40,000 for each of the three George B. Fuller pictures. However, the major figures on the art market became Manet, Monet, Degas, Cézanne, Renoir, Seurat, Van Gogh, Gauguin, Matisse, and Picasso.[2]

The prosperity also ushered in the art consciousness of the Chamber of Commerce, Rotary Clubs, Ladies Clubs, and "culture" to the tune of sixty new museums and thirteen new buildings from 1921 to 1930. The estimated cost of this new interest was approximately $16,000,000.[3]

PUBLICITY AND DEBATE

Modern art was being defended by some art critics working for the daily press--Henry McBride, Charles Fitzgerald[4] and James Gregg, Charles H. Caffin in the New York Evening Post and New York American, James Britton and D. Putnam Brinley in Art News, and James Huneker. Two free-lance critics, Christian Brinton and J. Nilson Laurvik, supported modernism as a return to a more primitive vision in the historical development of art. Another critic and author, Willard Huntington Wright, studied the function and psychology of art to discover properties common to all great art.[5] His hypothesis appeared

---

[1]Brown, American Painting, p. 93. [2]Brown, American Painting, p. 93.

[3]Brown, American Painting, p. 93.

[4]Also listed as Charles Fitz Gerald.

[5]Willard Huntington Wright, Modern Painting (New York: John Lane Company, 1915), p. 8.

first in the Forum and in the New Age, and later was expanded into the volume, Modern Painting, in 1915. The beginning of his defense reads as follows:

> Throughout the entire history of the fine arts, no period of aesthetic innovation and endeavour has suffered from public malignity; ridicule and ignorance as has painting during the last century. The reasons for this are many and, to the serious student of art history, obvious. The change between the old and the new order came swiftly and precipitously, like a cataclysm in the serenity of a summer night. The classic painters of the first half of the nineteenth century, such as David, Ingres, Gros, and Gérard, were busy with their rehabilitation of ancient traditions, when without warning, save for the pale heresies of Constable, a new and rigorous régime was ushered in. It was Turner, Delacroix, Courbet and Daumier who entered the sacred temple, tore down the pillars which had supported it for centuries, and brought the entire structure of established values crashing down about them. They survived the débâcle, and when eventually they laid aside their brushes for all time it was with the unassailable knowledge that they had accomplished the greatest and most significant metamorphasis in the history of any art.[1]

At the same time there were obviously those who criticized modern art. The Academy was sufficiently alive to be declared dead by some artists.[2] One critic, Kenyon Cox, who was aware of the historical development of modernism, believed that modernism like academicism arose from the alienation of the artist from the public. This alienation resulted in isolation and lack of understanding.

> Because of this (isolation) the artist has come to doubt all success and all understanding. Neglect and incomprehensibility become the hallmarks of greatness. At the same time, the shift from the patronage relation between artist and consumer to the public exhibition as the market for art has led to all the evils of the salon picture, such as sensationalism, technical display, and virtuosity.[3]

---

[1] Wright, p. 17. [2] Brown, American Painting, p. 81.

[3] Brown, American Painting, p. 84.

Like Cox, Frank Jewett Mather, Jr., art critic of the Nation, considered social causes to be the malady of art and distrusted the modernist search for freedom and originality.[1] Other critics of modernism were Royal Cortissoz, of the New York Tribune, Edwin Blashfield, Carroll Beckwith, and John Alexander, and the academicians who feared that modern art was an attack on the values and methods of academic training.

Although critics like Cox correctly assessed the alienation between the modern artist and the public, not all artists became frustrated. Furthermore the alienation was not interpreted entirely in the negative since the break was also defined as an "unfortunate but necessary estrangement."[2] "In the bewildering pace and chaos of the contemporary age the artist had to look for structure and this search is one of the most important contributions to the modernist group."[3]

Since it was no longer necessary for the artist to justify his work in the public marketplace, he was free "to claim a new spirit of artistic and personal freedom which would unhinge his dependence on older visual and empty aesthetic conventions. . . ."[4] Through his new forms and private myths, he could restore a sense of values which he could justify personally and, in developing his private search for truth, become "the conscience of his culture."[5]

---

[1] Brown, American Painting, p. 84.

[2] Irving Kaufman, Art and Education in Contemporary Culture (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1966), p. 63.

[3] American Painting & Sculpture (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1932-3), p. 18.

[4] Kaufman, p. 63. [5] Kaufman, p. 63.

CHAPTER 5

PIONEERING EFFORTS OF CHILD PSYCHOLOGISTS AND ART EDUCATORS

> Sir Herbert Reed rightly stated that it was 'a growing appreciation of primitive art and a revolutionary development in modern painting' which 'helped to bring children's art within the general range of aesthetic appreciation.[1]

The acceptance of the premises of the social realists, the experimentation of modern art, and the direct statement of primitive art aided in the acceptance of children's art. By accepting any type of visual expression[2] the public, artists, art critics, and art educators ushered in a wider concept of art. Art did not have to be "pretty" or look like the object in nature for its appeal. The communication of an idea through simplified symbols and colors expressive of the meaning was the essential element of the new art. In child art, as well as primitive art, many works communicated mystically through super-realistic symbols. Super-realistic symbols referred to the psychological and spiritual meaning the child incorporated into his art. These symbols arose from the tremendous desire of the child and primitive man to communicate. Their power of expression was noted by Macdonald in his statement: "I had the same telepathic experience in an Egyptian tomb, as if messages from long-dead artists filled the chamber."[3] A

---

[1] Stuart Macdonald, The History and Philosophy of Art Education (New York: American Elsevier Publishing Company, Inc., 1970), p. 329.

[2] Such as African sculpture, unconscious symbolism of children, and expressive rather than realistic color usage.

[3] Macdonald, p. 336.

similar experience was described by an art teacher, Marion Richardson, while looking at a children's art exhibition.

> Pictures are strange things to be with when it is getting dark; and six hundred of them had a great power. They shown, I felt that I could have stayed looking at them all night I might, possibly, have understood just what it is that goes into a drawing when it is made, and lives in it for ever and ever. . . .[1]

This concept of art reemphasized the basic premise of the social realists, that art was the expression of life wherever the artist found life. In contrast, art teachers who aided the academician's belief that primitive art and children's art were crude and that art should be pretty would not see expression as the primary purpose.

> Many artists and art teachers whose instincts for the good life were offended and often directly thwarted by the disorganization, the dirt and clutter, of twentieth-century urban life looked toward art--the art of the past--as a mode of spiritual release from the torments of the present.[2]

WORK OF CHILD PSYCHOLOGISTS

Closely paralleled to the work of the artists who helped change the goals of art, was the work of the art educators who pursued similar goals. In 1887 Corrado Ricci drew attention to the parallels between child art and primitive art. His studies were followed by others[3]

---

[1] Macdonald, p. 336.

[2] Frederick M. Logan, Growth of Art in American Schools (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955), pp. 132.

[3] Alfred Lichtward (trans), Art in the School in 1887; Dr. Theodore Koch-Grünberg, (trans.) Beginnings of Art in the Primeval Forest in 1905 and Two Years among the Indians in 1909; Siegfried Levinstein, (trans.) Inquiries about the Drawings of Children up to 14 years of Age in 1904; and Helen Tongue, Bushman Drawings in 1909.

who saw similarities such as execution, details, architectural concept of space, basic line outline to enclose mass and x-ray technique. James Sully in Studies in Childhood attempted to explain the nature of child art as play activity, not simply immature adult art.[1] His study distinguished a number of stages of schematic development.[2] In 1914 Max Veriwom, Kuh, Danzel, and others conducted a more thorough investigation classifying psychological types of art, later used by Viktor Lowenfeld.[3] Interest and studies in the development and nature of the child continued in the field of psychology and art education in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Europe. ". . . Progressive thought in art education had turned towards the idea of child-centered education well before the turn of the century; indeed by the time that Franz Cizek was starting his art class in Vienna. . ."[4] Cizek's work, however, was a real breakthrough, because these studies emphasized the nature of the child but did not foster an appreciation of the child's work as art. For instance, Sully referred to their art as "crude child art."[5]

CIZEK'S DISCOVERY: CHILD ART IS ART

---

[1]His study was followed by Levenstein (1905); Kerchensteiner (1905); Stein (1910); Rouma (1913); Luquet (1913); Krotzsch (1917); Burt (1922); Luquet (1927); Wulf (1927); and Eng (1931); to this list could be added Ruth Griffiths, Rhoda Kellogg, Lowenfeld, Arnheim, Desmond Morris, Read, Anschuler, Hattwick and Shaffer-Simmern.

[2]Michael Stevini, Art & Education (New York: Atherton Press, 1968) p. 57.

[3]Macdonald, p. 332.

[4]Dick Field, Change in Art Education (New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), p. 53.

[5]Macdonald, p. 329.

During his study in the Akademic der bildenden Künste, Franz Cizek became acquainted with the modern movement in architecture, painting, and design through his friends, Otto Wagner, Joseph Olbrich, Josef Hoffman, Karl Moser, and Gustav Klimt. Klimt, who painted symbolic pictures, made a deep impression on Cizek since he emphasized the need for creative modern art.[1] With Klimt's observations and his personal encounter with the graffiti of children, Cizek became intrigued with the rhythmic, symbolic, and decorative work of the children. Child art, he realized, is art. "It was this concept, rather than the work of Cizek's class, which proved a milestone in the philosophy of art education."[2] From this encounter Cizek's famous classes of experimental child art evolved in 1903. The Froebelian concept that the child like everything else has an innate drive to develop according to his nature dominated Cizek's philosophy of education. Inspiration and creativity were derived from the internal nature of the child.[3]

ARTHUR WESLEY DOW'S NEW APPROACH TO ART TEACHING

In 1908 Cizek became acquainted with the work of Professor Wesley Dow through the International Art Congress held in Britain. Both men exhibited striking children's work and according to R. R. Tomlinson, Cizek "was profoundly affected by the American drawings."[4] Due to his personality, Dow was able to gather devoted followers in Boston in 1889, in Brooklyn at the Pratt Institute, at the Art

---

[1]Macdonald, pp. 140-1. [2]Macdonald, p. 341. [3]Macdonald, p. 344.

[4]Macdonald, p. 342.

Students League, in the summers at Ipswich, Massachusetts, and at Teachers College.[1] From 1904 to 1922 Dow, employed at the Teachers College of Columbia University, advocated art for children instead of copying, and at this time the university "grew to dominate art teacher training in the United States."[2] Through his teaching and book Composition, Dow criticized the false academic division of art into categories of representative and decorative art claiming that both were imitative--one of nature, the other of conventional historic patterns. Wishing to replace the copying method, he advocated creating new forms from natural objects by using creatively the principles of design or composition. By outlining the elements of art as line, notan,[3] and color, he hoped to reclassify art in esthetic terms rather than historical terms.[4] In his classwork he logically designed the problems in art work progressing in difficulty from the simplest to the most complex. In assessing Dow's contribution to art education, Macdonald wrote: "The main contribution which Dow made to art education was that he diverted the schools from training in accurate drawing towards the practice and appreciation of art."[5]

---

[1] "Artistic Development and Logical Synthesis," Reprinted in Art Education Its Philosophy and Psychology (New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1956), p. 243. Also published as "The Dow Method and Public School Art" in the Journal of the Barnes Foundation, 1926; reprinted in Art and Education (N. J.: The Barnes Foundation Press, 1929).

[2] Macdonald, p. 348.

[3] Term, used especially with Japanese prints, indicates value or dark and light areas used to suggest mass.

[4] "Artistic Development and Logical Synthesis," pp. 243-4.

[5] Macdonald, p. 349.

JOHN DEWEY AS AN INNOVATIVE ART FIGURE

Like Dow, John Dewey's influence in art education was established by 1908. However, his influence was felt by general teachers, rather than special teachers through his widely quoted and discussed essays, "School and Society."[1] He believed that a child has primary experiences in life which he could not control, but art provided him with a means of control and synthesis. While expressing his idea, the child must relate technique to it. ". . . he (Dewey) realized that idea alone is not sufficient, for to claim that idea is all-important, and that technique is nothing, encouraged 'crude and slovenly habits of work.'"[2] For instance, a child who first attempted to draw a tree drew a tree symbol as he drew vertical lines for the trunk and horizontal lines for branches. From observation, his second drawing showed a better understanding of the tree's appearance. A third drawing, drawn from memory and imagination, showed the balance of technique and idea. "Also it seems reasonable to conclude that creativity proceeds not from imagination alone but from imagination shaped by prior experience."[3] While Dewey influenced many teachers, he was also involved in communications with many of the modern art and child art disseminators. For example, he spoke with Stieglitz as recorded by Seligman, his lectures were recorded in Barnes' Journal and book, he recorded

---

[1]Francis Bland Belshe, "A History of Art Education in the Public Schools in the United States" (Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Yale University, 1946), pp. 97-8.

[2]Belshe, pp. 100-1.

[3]Dewey, Imagination and Expression, pp. 61-2, cited by Belshe, p. 102.

"Franz Cizek and the Free Expression Method" in his book Art and Education, and some of his work was introduced through short quotes in Belle Boas' Art in the School.[1]

ROBERT HENRI AS AN ART EDUCATOR

Another innovative art teacher, Robert Henri, worked as a pioneer in the dissemination of modern art.[2] Of him, Bennard Perlman commented: ". . . Robert Henri's real fame lies in his capacity as an art educator."[3] In 1890 Henri began his teaching career at the Philadelphia School of Design for Women and continued as a life drawing instructor at the New York School of Art where he espoused his theory of art:

> One says he must earn a living--but why? Why live? It seems as though a great many who do earn the living or have it given them do not get much out of it. A sort of aimless racing up and down in automobiles, an aimless satisfaction in amassing money, an aimless pursuit of "pleasure," nothing personal, all external . . . It takes wit, and interest and energy to be happy. The pursuit of happiness is a great activity. One must be open and alive. It is the greatest feat man has to accomplish, and spirits must flow. There must be courage.[4]

As he believed that all subjects could be painted, he stimulated his students to search for subjects in burlesque houses, cheap music halls, saloons, and the streets of the city. One of his students at the Henri school, Helen Appleton Read, recalled:

---

[1]This book, written by one of Dow's students, records Dow's ideas on art education.

[2]See chapter one for more information on Robert Henri.

[3]Bennard B. Perlman, "Robert Henri," Arts Digest, (August 1, 1954), p. 14.

[4]Robert Henri, The Art Spirit (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1939), p. 140.

> The old idea (academic) was to learn to draw the figure before the student had ideas. Henri's idea was to have ideas first. . . . He tried to wean us away from the idea that we were art students, a state which immediately causes scales to grow over one's eyes, and to see things again as ordinary human beings. . .[1]

Through him, students were introduced to the works of Daumier, Manet, Degas, Goya, Thomas Eakins, Dostoievski, Tolstoy, and others, and Walt Whitman's Leaves of Grass was read aloud in class.[2] Students such as George Bellows, Rockwell Kent, Edward Hopper, Walter Pach, Glenn Coleman, Arnold Friedman, Vachel Lindsay, Man Ray, Niles Spencer, and Leon Trotsky studied under Henri. In addition to spreading his ideas through teaching, his book The Art Spirit gives the essence of Henri's thought. Since 1923, 76,000 copies have been sold, indicating the book's influence.

> It has had universal appeal because it addresses the audience on so many levels: as a painter's manual, a guide to aesthetic appreciation, a philosophy of art and life, and a spur to creative activity.[3]

INTERNATIONAL ART MEETINGS AND EXHIBITIONS

In addition to the changes made through the efforts of child studies and individual art educators, there were several international meetings of art educators to amalgamate the development of ideas in various countries. For instance, in 1900 one group met at the International Drawing Teachers Congress in Paris; in 1908 the

---

[1]"'I Paint My People' Is Henri's Art Key," Brooklyn Eagle, February 12, 1916, cited by William Innes Homer, Robert Henri and His Circle (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969), p. 150.

[2]Perlman, p. 14. [3]Homer, p. 182.

International Art Congress was held in Britain;[1] and another international exhibition was held in Berne in 1904. At the 1904 conference some of the following ideas were expressed:

> . . .That the instruction should follow the law of natural development in the child; that drawing should be a means of expression of thought and impression; the child should express himself.[2]

These international meetings coupled with international and local art exhibitions furthered the cause of accepting children's art as art. In 1890 the Children's Royal Academy, exhibiting children's art, received a favorable response from the Victorian public. Making her contribution to the recognition of child art at one of these exhibitions in 1892, the English Princess Louise bought a watercolor of a twelve-year-old girl entitled 'Babyland.'[3] Another international exhibition featured the work of students from the Mexican Open Air Art Schools founded by Alfredo Ramos Martinez in 1913. In the Open Air School, children were encouraged to select their own subjects and advance their techniques through experimentation. The exhibition of their work was shown in 1926 in Germany, Spain, and France. In Paris, artists such as Picasso, Matisse, and Derain, visited the exhibit frequently, and "in

---

[1]Included in this exhibition was the student work submitted by Cizek and Dow.

[2]John Fidel Rios, "History of Art Education in the Secondary Schools of the United States from 1900 to 1950" (Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The University of Texas, 1954), p. 68.

[3]Macdonald, p. 327.

all the countries, including the United States, noted critics filled pages of leading papers and magazines with their praise."[1]

Through exhibitions, international meetings, child psychologists, artists, and educators, the foundation for the acceptance of modern art, primitive art, and child art was established; but the awesome task of putting these concepts into classroom work remained.

---

[1]"Modern Art and Social Problems" Art Education Today (New York: Bureau of Publications, 1938), pp. 49-64.

CHAPTER 6

INNOVATIVE ART PROGRAMS IN THE SCHOOLS

> Art teaching in the elementary and secondary schools, while it continued to be impressed by the formulas of men like Bailey, did, after the First World War, begin to synthesize, as best its young teachers could, the mass of ideas bequeathed to it by the psychologists and artists, photographers, teachers, architects, and museum directors.[1]

THE INHERITED ART TRADITION IN SCHOOLS

Art education, as inherited from the nineteenth century demanded truth to the actual appearance of things. To record the beauties of nature, the artists should make pictures that appeared as photographs. Furthermore, the artist was expected to recreate the same response as the actual beauty of nature had illicited.[2] This kind of mirror-like representation demanded skill. Children's work, which was drawn symbolically rather than correctly or realistically, was described by Walter Smith as "'most offensive and impertinent in the lower grades.'"[3] The child, seen as an imperfect adult, was given exercises to improve his drawing ability.

---

[1] Frederick M. Logan, Growth of Art in American Schools (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955), p. 149.

[2] Ralph M. Pearson, The New Art Education (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1941), pp. 7-8.

[3] Stuart Macdonald, The History and Philosophy of Art Education (New York: American Elsevier Publishing Company, Inc., 1970), p. 260.

> Actually, what did happen was that the child became a vessel into which was indiscriminately poured the supposed accumulation of artistic technique and a limited aesthetic lore that arbitrarily cut across all of the hierarchies of creative endeavor.[1]

Attitudes such as these were not challenged by the teachers since "many teachers . . . were almost totally untrained either in the technique or appreciation of art. . . ."[2] Their methods, therefore, were chosen for their easiness to teach and to grade. Assignments were as follows: draw a box in true perspective; paint flowers in tints; and in some cases, follow the dots, three to the left, one up, and so forth, to produce an outlined object.[3] Another art study called "picture studies" lent itself more readily to a controlled classroom situation of the recitation-lecture method. In picture studies the child learned titles, artists, details of the artist's lives, the stories told by pictures, and other collectable data. "Ability to recognize a painting by Rembrandt, Leonardo da Vinci, or Holbein was a coveted mark of culture."[4] Such art teaching was an externalized learning, produced outside of the child's thinking or feeling. No personal expression or assimilation of the child's life into the total experience

---

[1]Irving Kaufman, Art and Education in Contemporary Culture (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1966), p. 58.

[2]"Artistic Development and Logical Synthesis" Published as "The Dow Method and Public School Art" in the Journal of the Barnes Foundation, 1926; reprinted in Art and Education, 1929; reprinted in Art Education Its Philosophy and Psycology, ed. Thomas Munro (New York: The Liberal Art Press, 1956), pp. 242-3.

[3]"Artistic Development and Logical Synthesis," pp. 242-3.

[4]Francis Bland Belshe, "A History of Art Education in the Public Schools in the United States" (Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Yale University, 1926), p. 66.

was attempted in this type of exercise. "Regimented by such materialism, the normal creative spirit in child, youth, or adult withers and dies."[1]

This kind of art teaching directly opposed the ideas of child psychologists, the new art educators such as Cizek and Dow, and the advocates of modern art and primitive art. The alternative was earlier summarized by Cook: "'The choice is between accuracy and interest, technical skill and child-nature. Agreed that truth must be had, but relative. The moral of the whole thing is rather--how to get it. . .'"[2]

BELLE BOAS PROMOTES DOW'S IDEAS

While art teaching still aimed generally at the perfection of technique, in the 1920's the new attitude towards children began to foster experimentation in various media. The provocative ideas of the art education leaders such as Cizek, Robert Henri, John Dewey, and Arthur Wesley Dow were implemented into various classroom situations. For instance, Belle Boas, Director of Fine Arts at the Horace Mann School[3] not only taught Dow's ideas but also wrote a book, Art in the School, to commemorate and promote his ideas. However, the order of study from the simplest to the more complex

---

[1]Pearson, p. 9.

[2]Michael Stevini, Art and Education (New York: Atherton Press, 1968), p. 46.

[3]Teachers college.

was altered in the modern schools to capitalize on the interest of the class.

> In other words a course of study in spelling doesn't arbitrarily begin with words of one syllable in the first grade to progress to complicated six-syllable words in the high school, but rather follows the growth in the child's vocabulary as he finds his spelling complexities grow through his needs.[1]

Class projects capitalized on all cultures and ages--Indian, Viking, Chinese, Egyptian, Greek, Islamic, Gothic, Renaissance, and Modern.[2] For instance, third grade classes studied the shape and motif of Viking shields for inspiration in a shield design project. "Fine division of space, one important mass, and one important color" were the ideas taught.[3] One of these third grade classes, beginning with this project, constructed Viking ships, a baronial hall, and Viking cloth dolls with shields.

Such projects were made easier and more accessible with the growth of art museums.[4] Not only did the art museums aid in project study but also helped develop art appreciation because children could see original art works in a good setting which was unequalled in reproductions.

> Appreciation is a large word which may be used loosely and vaguely. Appreciation of art is a love for the beautiful and a sense of discrimination which realizes that the fashion of the moment is not necessarily beautiful, and which does not mistake the pretty and banal for the great work of art. Appreciation comes with study and understanding, and, therefore, is necessarily slow in developing.[5]

---

[1] Belle Boas, Art in the School (New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1924), p. 20.

[2] Boas, pp. 66, 101. [3] Boas, p. 66. [4] Boas, p. 102. [5] Boas, p. 90.

Teaching appreciation as a "sense of discrimination" and "understanding" was quite different from the earlier rote learning of picture studies.

CIZEK'S WORK COUPLED WITH DEWEY'S INFLUENCE

While Dow's students were promoting his ideas tempered with the new findings in child development and interest, Cizek's ideas also became accessible to art classes in the United States. Following World War I, Francesca Wilson, while active in "Save the Children Fund," was introduced to Cizek and his work. In the 1920's she championed his ideas particularly through exhibitions and writings such as A Lecture of Professor Cizek, A Class at Professor Cizek's, and Creative Art in Childhood.

These writings became a part of the bibliography of a group of modern art educators. Other books on the list were Florence Cane's Teaching Children to Paint, Sheldon Cheney's A Primer of Modern Art, John Dewey's Art in Education, Gertrude Hartman's The Child and his School, Margaret Mathias' The Beginnings of Art in the Public School, and others. In The Child as Artist Cizek was quoted: "'All children have something to express, and it is the effect on them and on their development that is important, and not the finished product.'"[1] This attitude revolutionized art education, becoming the stance of art educators in several schools.[2] Thus, a heavy emphasis on process became a key

---

[1] Steveni, pp. 39-40.

[2] Some of the schools involved in the new art education ideals were Speyer School; Walden School, New York; Keither Country Day School Rochford, Illinois; Riverside School; and others.

consideration in art education.[1] An adherent to those ideas, Helen Ericson[2] described this change in art education as a reflection of "the new orientation of art training and appreciation."[3]

In these experimental classes children were often given a wide variety of materials with which to work--sewing machine, dyeing materials, textiles, scraps, leather tools, wood-working equipment, pencils, crayons, canvas, metal, reed, yarn, type, modeling clay, plaster, tempera, oil paints, water colors, and stages with lights and gelatine screens.[4] Children were encouraged to experiment--some with guidance and others in a completely free "do-it-if-you-want-to" environment. On the idea of experimentation, Elizabeth Ferm[5] summarized her position:

> Its distinction and value lies in its being a pure reflection of the inner life of the child. There are no external stimulus, suggestion or example; there are no art talks; no art walks; no journeys to museums. The children are free to paint all day or no day.[6]

---

[1] Steveni, p. 40.

[2] formerly head at the Riverside School one of the earlier Schools of Tomorrow, and in 1926 at Sunset Hill School in Kansas City, Missouri.

[3] Helen Ericson, "Influences in the Cultivation of Art Appreciation" Progressive Education, III (April-May-June, 1926), 179.

[4] L. Young Correthers, "The Development of Creative Impulses in Art Classes," Progressive Education, III (April-May-June, 1926), 107, and Elizabeth Byrne Ferm, "Creative Work at the Modern School" Progressive Education, III (April-May-June, 1926), 141.

[5] at the Modern School at Stelton, New Jersey. Organized and conducted Children's Neighborhood Playhouse in New Rochelle and a similar project in New York City.

[6] Ferm, p. 141.

Also involved in creativity but emphasizing a different approach on the part of the art teacher, Peppino Mangravite[1] believed that the art teacher must be "clairvoyant . . . to penetrate the mind and soul of a child. . . . Experimentation keeps alive the soul, out of which springs a new and beautiful growth--a new emotion."[2]

In their concern for preserving the individuality of the child, the art educators confronted a problem. Should they allow students to view and possibly be influenced by artists' solutions or should the students be kept free from all outside influences as Cizek advocated? Mangravite, agreeing with Cizek, stated, "Looking at pictures, (illustrated books, art galleries, art museums) if it teaches them (students) anything, teaches them the art of imitation."[3] Adding to the argument against external influences, L. Young Correthers[4] believed that students, shown old masters, would feel a sense of competition with the old masters. Breaking with the influence of tradition, the child, "feeling . . . that the result will be judged only from the point of view of his sincerity and truthfulness and not by laws formulated by experts of the old schools . . ." would produce creative work.[5] In agreement with

---

[1]studied painting under Guastini in Rome and a year in France studying contemporary French art. His paintings were exhibited in Rome, Venice, Paris and in many U.S. cities. He taught in Washington Montessori School and Potomac School and in 1926 had plans to teach art instructors.

[2]Peppino Mangravite, "The Artist and the Child" Progressive Education, III (April-May-June, 1926), 119, 123.

[3]Mangravite, 124.

[4]studied modern art abroad, in 1926 taught at the Keither County Day School at Rochford, Illinois.

[5]Correthers, 107.

Mangravite and Correthers, Ferm added additional criticism of outside direction.

> The child who has been subjected to direction is always noncreative, restless, exacting and capricious. He has been trained to look to the outside for suggestion and direction. . . . In the midst of his own unexplored nature, his own inexhaustible resources, the child is a beggar--stunted and starved, dependent upon the outside for help because that is where we adults have led him to believe that the source of supply exists.[1]

Disagreeing with these educators, Helen Ericson encouraged the use of good pictures. "Children should live and make personal and intimate relationships to works of art."[2] Katherine Gibson, from the Cleveland Museum of Art, sided with Ericson in the case for children's use of art galleries, believed that children who studied pictures in their museum would not lose creativity but would be aided in their creativity through the enriching influence of history and technique.[3]

These ideas, expressed by art educators in the 1920's, showed a change in attitude from the ideas of art educators at the turn of the century. While their ideas were based in varying degrees in the ideas of Cizek, Dow, Dewey, and Henri, each of the new educators interpreted new ideologies into his/her personal experiences and training, making varied results in ideas and in depth of thoughts. However, studying the new education and seeing the relationship between the modern movement and the new education, Logan summarized their work:

---

[1]Ferm, 143. [2]Ericson, 182.

[3]Katharine Gibson, "A Note on Creative Results from the Study of Art Appreciation," Progressive Education, III (April-May-June, 1926), 391.

> The most advanced position in the visual and plastic arts in 1929 seems to have been that of the best teaching done in the elementary schools. . . . Already the relationship of the best of children's work to the work of the German expressionists and the French Fauves was being understood. . . .[1]

---

1 Logan, p. 169.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

> Three factors contributed to the recognition of child art, namely studies in psychology, the growth of interest in primitive art, and the appreciation of the characteristics of modern art. These developments provided advocates of child art education with solid bases for reasoned argument and comparison.[1]

IDEOLOGICAL CHANGE

The combined efforts of artists, photographers, child psychologists, the press, private art collectors, art educators, international exhibitions, and books produced an ideological change. It changed from the tightly controlled, rigidly prescribed drawing and painting experiences and the literal, photographlike idea of beauty in nature to the importance of expression and experimentation in materials and esthetic problems. Artists involved in two basically different directions provided the creative stimulus necessary to evoke change. The leaders of the change were the social realists who changed the subject matter or picture content and the modernists who set up new goals in art for expressive and esthetic purposes.

Working simultaneously with the artists, child psychologists such as Sully, Cook, Lichtward, Koch-Grünberg, and Levenstein, were studying the natural development of children, focussing on the child's development as it related to the development of primitive art. These

---

[1]Stuart Macdonald, The History and Philosophy of Art Education (New York: American Elsevier Publishing Company, Inc., 1970), p. 320.

studies were the backbone of future art educators' work, since the acceptance of primitive art as art was comparable in many ways to accepting children's art as art. Both groups used art and its symbols as a means of communication, making expression their goal rather than beauty in nature or technique.

NEW ARTISTIC TRENDS BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE PUBLIC

While the artists and child psychologists provided the stimulus necessary for change, a catalyst was needed to spark an interaction between the innovators and the public. This interaction was provided through artists, students, press, art educators, and private collectors who brought the goals of the new art to the attention of the public. Due to interest sparked by the controversies of the press, the public, perhaps only in curiosity at first, went to see the new art. For instance, 75,000 people attended the Armory Show in New York City, 200,000 in Chicago, and 2,000 in one evening in the Independent Exhibition of 1910. Not only were the artists' works being shown, but also children's work. In child art exhibitions there were European shows of Mexican children, the International Art Congress of 1908, and the exhibitions of the Children's Royal Academy, as well as exhibitions in the United States. In April, 1912, children's paintings were shown at Stieglitz' gallery.

In addition to the publicity of individual leaders, widely publicized art shows and children's exhibitions, several books and magazines promoted the new art education themes. Included on this list would be Belle Boas' Art in the School, Arthur Wesley Dow's Composition, Robert Henri's The Art Spirit, the Progressive Education,

Jerome Eddy's Cubists and Post-Impression, and Barne's Journal. These writers often were collectors of the new art as well, and some of these collections served a further liaison purpose between artist and public when a number of the collections were given to educational institutions.

Although various groups of people were banded together under separate categories as art educators, artists, art patrons, and art collectors, individuals were actively involved in more than one aspect of the dissemination process.

> The same people who had interested themselves in the Armory Show were aware of the exhibit of Cizek's class-work. . . . Every step in the theater, every artist exploring the direction suggested by the Armory Show, were familar to the people active in the new movement in education.[1]

For instance, Henri's student, a Mrs. Cane, director of art and painting teacher at the Walden School in 1926, was one of the new art educators who defined her purpose: ". . .The direction of my teaching has been towards the liberation and growth of the child's soul through play and work and self-discipline involved in painting."[2] Another, Mrs. Avery Coonley, a financial sponsor of the expensive colored pictures in a special art display in Progressive Education, commissioned one of the pre-1914 Frank Lloyd Wright homes. Such unity of purpose and ideology aided in changing attitudes towards the acceptance of children's art

---

[1] Frederick M. Logan, Growth of Art in American Schools (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955), p. 163.

[2] Florence Cane, "Art in the Life of the Child," Progressive Education, III (April-May-June, 1926), 155.

because there was a common basis of comparison between children's art and an accepted form of mature art.

CHANGES IN ART CLASSROOMS IN THE 1920'S

These accepted ideological changes brought with them changes in the educational processes in the 1920's. One of these changes involved subject matter. Subjects, such as Viking shields, were chosen for child interest. No longer did children have to master drawing techniques such as drawing a box in perspective. In additio to introducing this interesting subject matter, teaching promoted un standing rather than rote learning in art appreciation. Through pro and museum visits which emphasized principles of education, the child would learn to distinguish between the banal and the great work of art. The basis of art was broadened through this kind of interest in the child. Whereas previously, art was for the child who had proficiency in drawing; in the 1920's, art[1] was for all children. It emphasized the growth of the child and intensity of e: ences. To further encourage children's interest and modern art ideals, children were encouraged to experiment with materials and techniques.

IMPLICATIONS FOR CHANGE IN ART EDUCATION

Although these factors produced a change in art education in t 1920's, not all teachers or teaching situations were able to absorb the implications for change. Irving Kaufman postulated that the ar teacher perhaps did not accept the new ideas deliberately but

---

[1]Being written about in literature and by the more progressive teachers--not by all.

rather that the ideas seeped in through osmosis.[1] Another explanation might be that the art educators understood more clearly the goals of child-centered art curriculum rather than the implications of modern art.

> This new spirit of the artist, either as a "hero" image of integrity, as a uniquely committed being, as a romantic rebel and visionary, or as a free-wheeling speculator, producing an art that was justifiable both in its own terms and as an aesthetic measure of man, has never really found its way into public art education . . . The need for personal integrity, for honest exploration, for free form making, for symbolic search to face pain and frustration as well as joy and achievement in the process, to gain insight, all of which makes for frequent outsize demands on individual attention and commitment, is reorganized into ordered and circumscribed sallies into the "domain of the imagination."[2]

In general, the art teachers found the rationale for freeing the child easier to grasp than the implications of artic responsibilities. With this experience-emphasis approach to art, the child in many schools felt no responsibility to art. Any intense experience was considered a good subject for art; no hierarchy of value was placed on experience other than the child's intensity of feeling. This kind of art had no intrinsic, esthetic, or spiritual values but was seen instead as a means of helping the child grow through certain schematic stages.

---

[1] Irving Kaufman, Art and Education in Contemporary Culture (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966), p. 63.

[2] Kaufman, pp. 63, 77.

"Creativity" often became an excuse for "a frivolous release from thought and the more revelatory reaches of the imagination."[1] Creativity, it was not realized, involved three conditions or factors: first, it involved an intense perceptual experience; second, an additional emotional response was necessary to reinforce the original experience; and third, intelligence and sufficient mastery of technique were essential to communicate the idea. While all children had the necessary experiences, not all children had the ability to express their ideas well. The opinion that all children were artists created problems in art, and Stieglitz quickly commented on it.

> America's tragedy was that there was an artist in every family. Every child who was innocent and could draw or work in colors was encouraged to think itself an artist, losing innocence because he did not know he had it. Why should there be art students, when pseudo-art was everywhere supported.[2]

Although such difficulties confronted new art education programs, and still do, these experimental teachers changed the trend in art instruction. This new trend formed the basis for current art programs and research with its interest in the child, its emphasis on experimentation in technique and media, and its approach to the study of esthetics.

---

[1] Joshua C. Taylor, "The History of Art in Education," A Seminar in Art Education for Research and Curriculum Development, project director Edward L. Mattil, (University Park, Penn.: The Pennsylvania State University, 1966), p. 44.

[2] Seligmann, p. 112.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

A. BOOKS

Arnason, H. H. History of Modern Art. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, (n. d.).

Boas, Belle. Art in the School. New York: Doubleday, Page, & Co., 1924.

Brown, Milton W. American Painting. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.

_____. The Story of the Armory Show. New York: Joseph Hirshorn Foundation, 1963.

De Francesco, Italo L. Art Education. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958.

Dewey, John. Art as Experience. New York: Minton, Balch, & Company, 1934.

Field, Dick. Change in Art Education. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.

Harris, Dale B. Children's Drawings as Measures of Intellectual Maturity. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963.

Henri, Robert. The Art Spirit. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1939.

Homer, William Innes. Robert Henri and His Circle. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969.

Kaufman, Irving. Art and Education in Contemporary Culture. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.

Logan, Frederick M. Growth of Art in American Schools. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955.

Macdonald, Stuart. The History and Philosophy of Art Education. New York: American Elsevier Publishing Company, Inc., 1970.

Packwood, Mary M. Art Education in the Elementary School. Washington: National Art Education Association, 1967.

Pearson, Ralph M. The New Art Education. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1941.

Poore, Henry R. The New Tendency in Art. Garden City: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1913.

Seligmann, Herbert J. Alfred Stieglitz Talking. New Haven: Yale University Library, 1966.

Steveni, Michael. Art & Education. New York: Atherton Press, 1968.

Van Dyke, John C. American Painting and Its Tradition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1919.

Wright, Willard Huntington. Modern Painting. New York: John Lane, Company, 1915.

B. PERIODICALS

Cane, Florence. "Art in the Life of the Child," Progressive Education, III (April-June, 1926), 155-162.

Correthers, L. Young. "The Development of Creative Impulses in Art Classes," Progressive Education, III (April-June, 1926), 105-109.

Ericson, Helen. "Influences in the Cultivation of Art Appreciation," Progressive Education, III (April-June, 1926), 179-182.

Ferm, Elizabeth B. "Creative Work at the Modern School," Progressive Education, III (April-June, 1926), 141-144.

Gibson, Katharine. "A Note on Creative Results from the Study of Art Appreciation," Progressive Education, III (April-June, 1926), 390-1.

"Henri is Dead," Art Digest, III (July, 1929), 11.

"In Defense of Henri," Art Digest, XXIX (March, 1955), 6.

Levin, Willy. "Plastic Art," Progressive Education, III (April-June, 1926), 110.

Mangravite, Peppino. "The Artist and the Child," Progressive Education, III (April-June, 1926), 119-124.

Mearns, Hughes. "The Creative Spirit and its Significance for Education," Progressive Education, III (April-June, 1926), 100-101.

"Metropolitan Shows Art of Henri, Leader of Independents," Art Digest, V (March, 1931), 8, 22.

New York Times, February 17, 1913.

Perlman, Bennard B. "Robert Henri," Art Digest, XXVIII (August, 1954), 14-15.

"Prince of Photography is Photographed," Art Digest, VII (February, 1933).

Steele, Ellen W. "Freeing the Child Through Art," Progressive Education, III (April-June, 1926), 169-173.

"Stieglitz Breaks a Vow," Art Digest, IX (January, 1935).

C. ESSAYS AND ARTICLES IN COLLECTIONS

Brittain, Lambert. (ed.). Creativity and Art Education. Washington National Art Education Association, n. d.

Dewey, John and others (ed.). Art in Education. New Jersey: Quinn & Boden Co., Inc., 1929.

Mattil, Edward L. (project director). A Seminar in Art Education Fo Research and Curriculum Development, University Park: Pennsyl State University, 1966.

Munro, Thomas. (ed.). Art and Education. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1956.

Pappas, George. (ed.). Concepts in Art and Education. New York: Macmillan Company, 1970.

D. UNPUBLISHED WORKS

Belshe, Francis Bland. "A History of Art Education in the Public Schools of the United States," Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Yale University, 1946. (microfilm)

Renfrow, Omer W. "A Study of Principles and Practices for Pictorial Art Appreciation Courses in the Elementary School." Unpublishe Doctor's dissertation, University of Cincinatti, 1939.

Rios, John Fidel. "History of Art Education in the Secondary School of the United States from 1900 to 1950." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Texas, 1954.